UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/761,469	01/21/2004	Ted T. Nguyen	200316371-1	2914

22879 7590 03/27/2008

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER	
GILLIS, BRIAN J	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2141	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/27/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
mkraft@hp.com
ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/761,469	NGUYEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brian J. Gillis	2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 January 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-34* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *21 January 2004* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *01212004*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The claimed “computer readable medium” in claims 26 and 27 lacks antecedent basis in the specification.

Claim Objections

Claims 11-14 are objected to because of the following informalities: The claims are depending from themselves. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 2-9, 11-14, 22, 27, and 29-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 2-9 and 11-14 and 29-34 recites the limitation "the station" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 22 recites the limitation "the return error message" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 22 recites the limitation "the SNMP request" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 27 recites the limitation "the medium" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 15-18 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis (US Patent #5,719,882) in view of Maso et al (US PGPUB US2003/0061265).

Claim 1 discloses a network management station, comprising: a processor; a memory coupled to the processor; and program instructions provided to the memory and executable by the processor to: transmit an SNMP message to a device connected to the management station over a network; open a socket connection on the device in

response to an SNMP error message returned from the device; and initiate a time-out function upon opening the socket connection. Ellis teaches a management station is a device that processes commands and has a processor and memory (column 4, lines 9-16), the manager sends a message using SNMP to a device (column 4, lines 29-46), and if the manager does not receive an acknowledgement a time period is set before a time-out (column 4, lines 47-65). It fails to teach opening a socket connection on the device in response to an SNMP error message returned from the device. Maso et al teaches if a device replies with a message and is not registered then a socket connection is opened (paragraph 137).

Ellis and Maso et al are analogous art because they are both related to monitoring network information.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the socket connection establishing feature in Maso et al with the system in Ellis because failures are recognized quickly to prevent noticeable failures (Maso, paragraph 40).

Claim 2 discloses the station of claim 1, wherein the program instructions include a platform independent function call to execute instructions which open the socket connection. Maso et al further teaches a Java function opens the socket (paragraphs 119 and 137).

Claim 3 discloses the station of claim 2, wherein the platform independent function call is a Java based function call. Maso et al further teaches the system is built with Java (paragraph 119).

Claim 4 discloses the station of claim 1, wherein the SNMP error message includes a generic error message. Maso et al further teaches the use of the SNMP standard messages (paragraphs 191 and 192).

Claim 5 discloses the station of claim 1, further including program instructions which can execute to selectably establish a time period in connection with the time-out function based on input from a network administrator. Ellis further teaches the hub manager establishes the time period (column 5, lines 9-15).

Claim 8 discloses the station of claim 1, wherein the device and the station are connected over a local area network (LAN). Ellis further teaches the devices are connected across a network which is widely known to include a LAN (column 3, lines 40-41).

Claim 9 discloses the station of claim 1, wherein the device and the station are connected over a wide area network (WAN). Ellis further teaches the devices are connected across a network which is widely known to include a WAN (column 3, lines 40-41).

Claim 15 discloses a method for device status identification, comprising: transmitting an SNMP message to a device; opening a socket connection on the device in response to an SNMP error message returned from the device; and initiating a time-out function upon opening the socket connection. Ellis teaches, the manager sends a message using SNMP to a device (column 4, lines 29-46), and if the manager does not receive an acknowledgement a time period is set before a time-out (column 4, lines 47-65). It fails to teach opening a socket connection on the device in response to an

SNMP error message returned from the device. Maso et al teaches if a device replies with a message and is not registered then a socket connection is opened (paragraph 137).

Ellis and Maso et al are analogous art because they are both related to monitoring network information.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the socket connection establishing feature in Maso et al with the system in Ellis because failures are recognized quickly to prevent noticeable failures (Maso, paragraph 40).

Claim 16 discloses the method of claim 15, further including using a platform independent function call to open the socket connection on the device. Maso et al further teaches a Java function opens the socket (paragraphs 119 and 137).

Claim 17 discloses the method of claim 16, further including using a Java based function call to open the socket connection on the device. Maso et al further teaches the system is built with Java (paragraph 119).

Claim 18 discloses the method of claim 15, further including establishing a time out period in association with the time-out function. Ellis further teaches the hub manager establishes the time period (column 5, lines 9-15).

Claim 26 discloses a computer readable medium having instructions for causing a device to perform a method, comprising: transmitting an SNMP message to a device on a network; opening a socket connection on the device in response to an SNMP error message returned from the device; and initiating a time-out function upon opening the

socket connection. Ellis teaches, the manager sends a message using SNMP to a device (column 4, lines 29-46), and if the manager does not receive an acknowledgement a time period is set before a time-out (column 4, lines 47-65). It fails to teach opening a socket connection on the device in response to an SNMP error message returned from the device. Maso et al teaches if a device replies with a message and is not registered then a socket connection is opened (paragraph 137).

Ellis and Maso et al are analogous art because they are both related to monitoring network information.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the socket connection establishing feature in Maso et al with the system in Ellis because failures are recognized quickly to prevent noticeable failures (Maso, paragraph 40).

Claims 10-14, 23-25 and 28-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis (US Patent #5,719,882) in view of Maso et al (US PGPUB US2003/0061265) in view of Grieve et al (US PGPUB US2003/0149756).

Claim 10 discloses a network management station, comprising: a processor; a memory coupled to the processor; and program instructions provided to the memory and executable by the processor to: send an SNMP request to a device connected to the management station over a network; register a return error message to the SNMP request from device; execute a Java based function call to open a socket connection on the device in response to the return error message; initiate a time-out function upon opening the socket connection; and indicate a device status based on successful SNMP

requests and the time-out function. Ellis teaches a management station is a device that processes commands and has a processor and memory (column 4, lines 9-16), the manager sends a message using SNMP to a device (column 4, lines 29-46), and if the manager does not receive an acknowledgement a time period is set before a time-out (column 4, lines 47-65). It fails to teach registering a return error message to the SNMP request from device; execute a Java based function call to open a socket connection on the device in response to the return error message and indicate a device status based on successful SNMP requests and the time-out function. Maso et al teaches if a device replies with a message and is not registered then a socket connection is opened with a Java function (paragraph 119 and 137).

Ellis and Maso et al are analogous art because they are both related to monitoring network information.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the socket connection establishing feature in Maso et al with the system in Ellis because failures are recognized quickly to prevent noticeable failures (Maso, paragraph 40).

Ellis in view of Maso et al teaches the limitations as recited above. It fails to teach indicating a device status based on successful SNMP requests and the time-out function. Grieve et al teaches the status of the device is determined based on the SNMP messages and a time out function (paragraph 174).

Ellis in view of Maso et al and Grieve et al are analogous art because they are both related to network managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the status determining feature in Grieve et al with the system in Ellis in view of Maso et al because an intelligent configuration of the network may be obtained centrally (Grieve, paragraph 5).

Claim 11 discloses the station of claim 11, wherein the program instructions execute to indicate the device status is up upon receiving successful SNMP requests. Grieve et al further teaches the device status is based on received SNMP messages (paragraph 174).

Claim 12 discloses the station of claim 12, wherein the program instructions execute to indicate the device status is up when: a return error message to the SNMP request is registered by the program instructions; and a response is received by the program instructions prior to an expiration of the time-out function. Grieve et al further teaches the device returns messages in reference to the SNMP request (paragraph 174), and the messages are received prior to the device timing out (paragraph 174).

Claim 13 discloses the station of claim 13, further including program instructions to selectably establish a time-out period in association with the time-out function. Ellis further teaches the hub manager establishes the time period (column 5, lines 9-15).

Claim 14 discloses the station of claim 12, wherein the program instructions execute to indicate the device status is down when: a return error message to the SNMP request is registered by the program instructions; and a time-out failure message associated with the time-out function is received by the program instructions. Grieve et

al further teaches an error is reported from the device (paragraph 174), and the device times out (paragraph 174).

Claim 23 discloses a method for device status identification, comprising: sending an SNMP request to a device; registering a return error message from the device in response to the SNMP request; executing a Java based function call to open a socket connection on the device in response to the return error message; initiating a time-out function upon opening the socket connection; and indicating a device status based on successful SNMP requests and the time-out function. Ellis teaches the manager sends a message using SNMP to a device (column 4, lines 29-46), and if the manager does not receive an acknowledgement a time period is set before a time-out (column 4, lines 47-65). It fails to teach registering a return error message to the SNMP request from device; execute a Java based function call to open a socket connection on the device in response to the return error message and indicate a device status based on successful SNMP requests and the time-out function. Maso et al teaches if a device replies with a message and is not registered then a socket connection is opened with a Java function (paragraph 119 and 137).

Ellis and Maso et al are analogous art because they are both related to monitoring network information.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the socket connection establishing feature in Maso et al with the system in Ellis because failures are recognized quickly to prevent noticeable failures (Maso, paragraph 40).

Ellis in view of Maso et al teaches the limitations as recited above. It fails to teach indicating a device status based on successful SNMP requests and the time-out function. Grieve et al teaches the status of the device is determined based on the SNMP messages and a time out function (paragraph 174).

Ellis in view of Maso et al and Grieve et al are analogous art because they are both related to network managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the status determining feature in Grieve et al with the system in Ellis in view of Maso et al because an intelligent configuration of the network may be obtained centrally (Grieve, paragraph 5).

Claim 24 discloses the method of claim 23, further including indicating a device is up if a message is returned from the socket connection of the device prior to an expiration of the time-out function. Grieve et al further teaches the device returns messages in reference to the SNMP request (paragraph 174), and the messages are received prior to the device timing out (paragraph 174).

Claim 25 discloses the method of claim 23, further including indicating a device is down if no message is returned from the socket connection of the device prior to an expiration of the time-out function. Grieve et al further teaches an error is reported from the device (paragraph 174), and the device times out (paragraph 174).

Claim 28 discloses a network management station, comprising: a processor; a memory coupled to the processor; and means for determining a status of a device connected to the management station over a network in a platform independent

manner. Ellis teaches a management station is a device that processes commands and has a processor and memory (column 4, lines 9-16). It fails to teach determining the status of a device in a platform independent manner. Maso et al teaches if a device replies with a message and is not registered then a socket connection is opened with a Java function (paragraph 119 and 137).

Ellis and Maso et al are analogous art because they are both related to monitoring network information.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the socket connection establishing feature in Maso et al with the system in Ellis because failures are recognized quickly to prevent noticeable failures (Maso, paragraph 40).

Ellis in view of Maso et al teaches the limitations as recited above. It fails to teach determining the status of a device. Grieve et al teaches the status of the device is determined based on the SNMP messages and a time out function (paragraph 174).

Ellis in view of Maso et al and Grieve et al are analogous art because they are both related to network managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the status determining feature in Grieve et al with the system in Ellis in view of Maso et al because an intelligent configuration of the network may be obtained centrally (Grieve, paragraph 5).

Claim 29 discloses the station of claim 28, wherein the means includes program instruction which execute to send a simple network management protocol (SNMP)

request to the device. Ellis further teaches the manager sends the message using SNMP to the device (column 4, lines 29-46).

Claim 30 discloses the station of claim 29, wherein the means includes program instruction which execute to register successful SNMP requests as an up status for the device. Grieve et al further teaches the device status is based on received SNMP messages (paragraph 174).

Claim 31 discloses the station of claim 29, wherein the means includes program instructions which execute to register an up status for the device when: a return error message to an SNMP request is received by the program instructions; and a response message associated with opening a socket connection on the device is received by the program instructions prior to an expiration of a time-out function. Grieve et al further teaches the device returns messages in reference to the SNMP request (paragraph 174), and the messages are received prior to the device timing out (paragraph 174).

Claim 32 discloses the station of claim 29, wherein the means includes program instructions which execute to register a down status for the device when: a return error message to an SNMP request is received by the program instructions; and a time-out failure message associated with a time-out function is received by the program instructions. Grieve et al further teaches an error is reported from the device (paragraph 174), and the device times out (paragraph 174).

Claim 33 discloses the station of claim 29, wherein the means includes program instructions having a platform independent function call to execute instructions which

open a socket connection on the device. Maso et al further teaches a Java function opens the socket (paragraphs 119 and 137).

Claim 34 discloses the station of claim 33, wherein the platform independent function call is a Java based function. Maso et al further teaches the system is built with Java (paragraph 119).

Claims 6, 7, 19, 21, 22, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis (US Patent #5,719,882) in view of Maso et al (US PGPUB US2003/0061265) as applied to claims 1, 15, and 26 above, and further in view of Grieve et al (US PGPUB US2003/0149756).

Claim 6 discloses the station of claim 1, further including program instructions which execute to indicate a status of the device based on successful SNMP messages and the time-out function. Ellis in view of Maso et al teaches the limitations of claim 1 as recited above. It fails to teach indicating a status of the device based on successful SNMP messages and the time-out function. Grieve et al teaches the status is determined based on SNMP messages and a time-out function (paragraph 174).

Ellis in view of Maso et al and Grieve et al are analogous art because they are both related to network managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the status determining feature in Grieve et al with the system in Ellis in view of Maso et al because an intelligent configuration of the network may be obtained centrally (Grieve, paragraph 5).

Claim 7 discloses the station of claim 1, wherein the program instructions execute to indicate a device is down when both the SNMP error message and a time-out failure message are received. Ellis in view of Maso et al teaches the limitations of claim 1 as recited above. It fails to teach indicating a device is down when both the SNMP error message and a time-out failure message are received. Grieve et al teaches a failure occurs if a time out occurs and an error is received (paragraph 174).

Ellis in view of Maso et al and Grieve et al are analogous art because they are both related to network managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the status determining feature in Grieve et al with the system in Ellis in view of Maso et al because an intelligent configuration of the network may be obtained centrally (Grieve, paragraph 5).

Claim 19 discloses the method of claim 18, further including indicating the device is down upon: registering the SNMP error message; and receiving a time-out failure message associated with the time-out function. Ellis in view of Maso et al teaches the limitations of claim 18 as recited above. It fails to teach registering the SNMP error message and receiving a time-out failure message associated with the time-out function. Grieve et al teaches an error is reported from the device (paragraph 174), and the device times out (paragraph 174).

Ellis in view of Maso et al and Grieve et al are analogous art because they are both related to network managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the status determining feature in Grieve et al with the system in Ellis in view of Maso et al because an intelligent configuration of the network may be obtained centrally (Grieve, paragraph 5).

Claim 21 discloses the method of claim 15, further including indicating the device is up upon receiving successful SNMP requests. Ellis in view of Maso et al teaches the limitations of claim 15 as recited above. It fails to teach indicating the device is up upon receiving successful SNMP requests. Grieve et al teaches the status is determined based on SNMP messages returned (paragraph 174).

Ellis in view of Maso et al and Grieve et al are analogous art because they are both related to network managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the status determining feature in Grieve et al with the system in Ellis in view of Maso et al because an intelligent configuration of the network may be obtained centrally (Grieve, paragraph 5).

Claim 22 discloses the method of claim 15, further including indicating the device is up upon: registering the return error message to the SNMP request; and receiving a response prior to an expiration of the time-out function upon opening the socket connection. Ellis in view of Maso et al teaches the limitations of claim 15 as recited above. It fails to teach registering the return error message to the SNMP request; and receiving a response prior to an expiration of the time-out function upon opening the socket connection. Grieve et al teaches the device returns messages in reference to

the SNMP request (paragraph 174), and the messages are received prior to the device timing out (paragraph 174).

Ellis in view of Maso et al and Grieve et al are analogous art because they are both related to network managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the status determining feature in Grieve et al with the system in Ellis in view of Maso et al because an intelligent configuration of the network may be obtained centrally (Grieve, paragraph 5).

Claim 27 discloses the medium of claim 26, further including indicating a device status based on successful SNMP requests and the time-out function. Ellis in view of Maso et al teaches the limitations of claim 26 as recited above. It fails to teach indicating a device status based on successful SNMP requests and the time-out function. Grieve et al teaches the status is determined based on SNMP messages and a time-out function (paragraph 174).

Ellis in view of Maso et al and Grieve et al are analogous art because they are both related to network managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the status determining feature in Grieve et al with the system in Ellis in view of Maso et al because an intelligent configuration of the network may be obtained centrally (Grieve, paragraph 5).

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ellis (US Patent #5,719,882) in view of Maso et al (US PGPUB US2003/0061265) in view of

Grieve et al (US PGPUB US2003/0149756) as applied to claim 19 above, and further in view of Richardson (US Patent #6,054,987).

Claim 20 discloses the method of claim 19, further including visually indicating the device is down using a colored icon. Ellis in view of Maso et al in view of Grieve et al teaches the limitations of claim 19 as recited above. It fails to teach visually indicating the device is down using a colored icon. Richardson teaches the device status is identified by colored icons (column 1, line 62 – column 2, line 8).

Ellis in view of Maso et al in view of Grieve et al and Richardson are analogous art because they are both related to network managing.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the visual indicating feature in Richardson with the system in Ellis in view of Maso et al in view of Grieve et al because the current status can be easily inspected by a user (Richardson, column 1, line 62 – column 2, line 8).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Nilakantan et al (US Patent #5,541,911) teaches of a remote filtering communication management system. Gupta (US PGPUB US2003/0009543) teaches of a network management system.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian J. Gillis whose telephone number is (571)272-7952. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian J Gillis
Examiner
Art Unit 2141

/B. J. G./
Examiner, Art Unit 2141

/Jason D Cardone/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145